DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 260 SP 034 453

AUTHOR Woloszyk, Carl A.; Davis, Suzanne
TITLE Restructuring a Teacher Preparation Program Using the Professional Development School Concept.
PUB DATE 15 Feb 93
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (73rd, Los Angeles, CA, February 13-17, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Educational Change; *Educational Principles; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Partnerships in Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; School Districts; School Role; Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS Holmes Group; Oakland University MI; *Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

Improved professional education for teachers, counselors, and school administrators is needed in order to successfully reform schooling. Fundamental change in professional education requires educational partnerships between schools and universities. The professional development school (PDS) represents a pivotal element in the strategy of utilizing partnerships to effect restructuring of schools and teacher education programs. The place of these schools in the professional preparation of educators is considered analogous to the place of teaching hospitals in medical education. Although there are similarities between PDSs and laboratory schools, there are also differences that contribute to the PDSs' uniqueness. Establishing a PDS is a complex process, which can be expected to pass through four phases of development: exploration, orientation, implementation, and operation. This paper provides guidelines and identifies issues related to each phase. Two documents are included in the appendices: "Oakland University [Michigan] and Pontiac Schools Professional Development Schools: Criteria for Partners" and "Application for Oakland University-Pontiac Professional Development School." (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED360260

Restructuring a Teacher Preparation Program Using the Professional Development School Concept

Association of Teacher Educators
73 rd Annual Meeting

Presenters

Carl A. Woloszyk, Ph.D.
Department of Consumer Resources and Technology
Western Michigan University

Suzanne Davis, Ph.D.
Department of Education and Professional Development
Western Michigan University

February 15, 1993

SP034453

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CARL Woloszyk
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Restructuring a Teacher Preparation Program Using the Professional Development School Concept

Background

While our economy and work force have changed dramatically within the last century, public school education has lagged far behind. Recent national studies recommend that schools must be strengthened in order to prepare today's youth to live and work in a world of ideas, information, and constant change. The structure and even the fundamental purposes of our public schools must be redefined and reformed. Meaningful school reform resides in a redirection and re-examination of how we do things. However, the required changes will not come easily. As Schlechty (Schools for the 21st Century, 1990) points out, there are really only four areas within the educational establishment subject to reform: time, space, content, and method.

A central focus for school improvement must also involve a fundamental restructuring and continued improvement in the recruitment, selection, and preparation of future teachers, counselors and administrators.

1. Teaching for "new learning" is challenging, demanding, and requires a new and more sophisticated pedagogy. New pedagogy needs to be supported and sustained by new approaches to school organization and management. There can be no change in pedagogy, school organization and management, unless the entire system of teacher education and leadership preparation is changed. Fundamental change in the way we prepare and continually develop teachers, counselors, and school administrators is essential to successful restructuring of schools.

2. Fundamental change in professional education can be effected only through a strategy that engages practitioners and clients at all levels in the education system. Improved professional education will require educational partnerships between universities and school districts, and new connections with business, community groups, and parents.

Introducing Professional Development Schools

The Holmes Group was organized in 1986 as a consortium of nearly 100 American research universities committed to making teacher preparation programs more rigorous and integrated with the liberal arts. Their goals were: (a) improved intellectual preparation of teachers in the arts and sciences and in education; (b) improved assessment and evaluation of teacher education achieved through flexible approaches; (c) increased collaborative effectiveness among colleges of education and arts and sciences and the public schools; and (d) improved environments in which teachers work, practice, and learn.

According to the Holmes Group (1990), six underlying principles are fundamental to the design of Professional Development Schools. These design principles are:

Principle #1: Teach for understanding so that students learn for a lifetime.

Principle #2: Organize the school and its classrooms as a community of learning.

Principle #3: Hold ambitious learning goals for everybody's children.

Principle #4: Teach adults as well as children.

Principle #5: Make reflection and inquiry the central feature of the school.

Principle #6: Invent a new organization.

The strategy for fundamental change in professional education must include a dynamic, balanced interaction between well founded, thoughtful demand for change from outside the system and new knowledge and leadership from within.

The Holmes Group recommended the establishment of Professional Development Schools (PDS), analogous to teaching hospitals in the medical profession, as vehicles to provide the necessary linkages between colleges of education and the public schools. Professional Development Schools have existed in many forms since the late nineteenth century and have been described as school settings focused on the professional development of teachers and the development of pedagogy. Laboratory schools, embedded in schools of education, were the earliest forms of Professional Development Schools. John Dewey (1896) compared the need for a teacher's professional development lab to that of a scientist's or a medical practitioner's. However, there are fundamental differences between a PDS and a laboratory school.

Professional Development School	Laboratory School
- focus is upon at risk students in real public schools	-focus is upon "selected" students in private institutions
- learning is defined as thinking and metacognition	- learning is defined as the acquisition of information
- research generates theory for classroom practice	- research validates theoretical constructs
- investigations are characterized as problem solving, "action" research	- investigations are characterized as empirical research
- long-term staff development is targeted at continual learning	- one shot in-service programs are assessed for motivation

- needs and focus of school are determined by building staff in collaboration with university faculty	- needs and focus of school are determined by university faculty
- preservice students are considered a part of the school community	-preservice students are considered as visitors to the school community

The Professional Development School (PDS) is at the core of restructuring education. The PDS is unique. While it is a site for schooling, it is not representative of the typical school culture; while it is a site for teacher education, it is not representative of the typical research culture. It is unique social institution in its own right; it will develop its own culture distinct from the traditions of schools, teacher education institutions, or research universities. The PDS will not serve as merely a bridge between the school and university; it is, instead, a new institution composed of a community of professionals committed to fundamental change which will make education more effective and efficient in producing new learning for all children, youth, and adults. Professional Development Schools are community centered schools where teachers, university faculty, school and university administrators join together in working relationships to study, plan, and implement programs and methods designed to create new educational opportunities for youth and adults. (Michigan Partnership for a New Education, 1990)

Professional Development Schools are designed as places of change, demonstration, inquiry, and self-renewal. Principals, teachers, counselors, and support staff in the local school and university faculty work as colleagues to determine what changes are needed in instruction, curriculum, organization, and management. This team approach will change schools to institutions where all children learn for understanding and are motivated to

be life-long learners. Educators should not work alone; rather they need to collaborate with local businesses, community organizations, parents, and citizen volunteers in the change process.

Planning for a Professional Development School

The establishment of a Professional Development School is a complex endeavor for a university. There are many challenges to establishing a Professional Development School. Some of the challenges include:

1. Not all public school and communities will favorably respond to a Professional Development School innovation. Some teachers, administrators, and parents will object to the idea of "experimenting" on their students. Concepts and guidelines for responsible innovation must be developed in concert with cooperating local school districts. School board and parental support must be present.

2. Current university reward systems are largely non existent for recognizing school and university collaboration work. Alternative or revised procedures for tenure, merit pay, promotion, and faculty reassigned time will need to be addressed.

3. A complex set of existing school rules, regulations, and procedures will often interfere with the effort and will need to be waived or changed to accommodate the innovation.

4. Substantial effort will be required to "recruit " and prepare a substantial number of faculty who are willing to work in a Professional Development School site.

5. Many teachers and administrators and some university teacher educators are unaccustomed and unskilled in the conduct of collaborative research and development with school teachers, counselors, and administrators.

6. The personnel costs of collaborative inquiry and program development are high at a time when university and school district staff sizes and resources are limited.

7. The dilemma of trying to innovate in and study a demonstration site, which attempts to suggest productive practices for others, as well as for the demonstration site, will need to be confronted. Because a Professional Development School is "unreal" in the sense of innovation there must still be the recognition that the school is a part of the "real world " of a public school district.

8. Teacher compensation and/or various approaches to differentiated staffing will require complicated negotiations with local school boards and teacher associations.

9. University administrators will need to commit the a greater level of financial resources to the preparation of a trained educational workforce, while focusing more on the quality of preparation rather than the quantity of the those individuals prepared to work in the schools.

The development of a Professional Development School partnership between a university and a local school district might not be a viable alternative for every higher education institution within a state. However, if a university seeks to restructure its teacher preparation program through the use of the professional development school concept, certain activities and planning steps will need to occur for successful implementation of the partnership.

Professional Development Schools may be defined as working models of restructured schools developed and operated by local school and university educators functioning as colleagues. These schools : 1) operate exemplary programs , 2) serve as an institutional base for educating teachers and

administrators, 3) demonstrate the new K-12 and professional education, and 4) conduct applied research and product development. The schools are "real" community based schools where teachers, university faculty, school and university administrators join together in a working relationship to study, plan, and implement programs and methods designed to create new educational institutions. Policy makers, business and community service persons, students, and parents are also partners in these schools, and provide support for them.

Professional Development Schools can be expected to proceed through four phases of development: exploration, orientation, implementation, and operation.

Exploration

This is the period of time in the establishment of Professional Development Schools (PDS) when potential partners, typically a local school district and a university decide whether a school-university alliance might be possible. During this period the university and school district learn about the Professional Development School concept, develop a vision for education in the local community, conduct a community appraisal, and make a decision to develop a Professional Development School, and engage in a process to select the school.

General Guidelines

There is a high measure of risk-taking (personal, professional, and financial) involved with the establishment of professional development schools. Accordingly, a school district must be genuinely supportive of change and innovation. A school district's overall commitment for embracing concepts for improved teaching and learning is a an indication of willingness to participate in a long-term school and university collaborative.

General guidelines for a university interested in the establishment of a Professional Development School involved with this stage of development are to:

1. Choose a school district which is representative of today's student population.

This is not to say that initial PDS schools cannot be located in a rural, suburban, or urban setting only that particular attention should be given to having PDS sites in combination, or by themselves, which represent the diversity of the current student population.

2. Build on previously successful school and university relationships.

Initial PDS sites should be built upon mutual respect for each agency, which will ultimately be involved with the school and university partnership. Long term arrangements, such as student teaching involvement, and, short-term special projects, such as in-service programs and personal relationships between individual school and university faculty can assist in building a long-term commitment to a potential PDS partnership.

3. Select a school district, which demonstrates a strong commitment to the community.

Professional Development Schools work best where individual school and university faculty have a strong commitment to working with parents and other members of the community. Our increasingly complex society demands that partnerships be established in areas where responsible citizens can assist in the education of students and teachers.

4. Involve schools and communities which share a united commitment to higher learning for all children and youth.

Key organizations, including employers, in a community should share a willingness to allocate human and financial resources to support innovation and change in schools. Change not for change sake, but change in the interests of better learning for students and teachers.

5. Involve innovative and progressive school districts.

Assessing the Situation

Normally at this stage teacher association leadership, local and university administration, business and community members explore the general concept of a Professional Development School partnership at large informational meetings. Extensive individual discussions, conversations, independent readings and deliberations are held following the general informational meetings between association, school and university personnel. Visits are scheduled and arranged to operational PDS sites, which provide additional background information necessary for informed decision-making.

These activities by the school leadership personnel lead to agreement or disagreement as to the feasibility of establishing a Professional Development School for the school district with the support and active involvement of the university. If an "agreement" is reached to establish a Professional Development School, local school administration, university administration, and local educational association leadership make a commitment to formally begin the orientation phase in the development of a Professional Development School for the district.

Orientation

After a decision to establish a school/university partnership has been made the orientation and developmental stage begins. A series of general understandings underlie the orientation stage. These understandings are as follows:

1. active participation on the part of influential school, university, and community leaders to fully understand and further the innovation work of the Professional Development School sites.

2. The availability of human talent and financial backing together with funding available for developing the local area partnership is determined.

3. The local area partnership makes a commitment to develop annual goals and related work plans. In addition a commitment is made to document annual achievements and to maintain appropriate records of financial transactions is secured.

Getting Organized

At this stage of development an internal steering group of university representatives, begins to meet to develop the operational guidelines and staffing arrangements necessary to bring the partnership into fruition. Concurrent to the internal university steering committee a community based "partnership planning team" is formed to develop the selection criteria for the future Professional Development School (s). The planning committee composed of both university and school staff begin to develop working relationships, an understanding of school conditions and needs and the potential of the partnership. In the community a "Roundtable " may be formed with business, education, and social/community services agencies. During the orientation phase extensive active discussion occurs between local and university administration, educational associations and individual building administrators, teachers, and community members.

The community based partnership planning team is charged with selecting a Professional Development School site. The partnership planning

team should include members of the community, district administrators, association teacher leaders, and university officials.

Selecting the Site

The planning team or a sub committee of representatives should solicit active participation in the site selection process by developing an application, criteria for submitting an application, and timelines for submission. This information is shared with local building principals, association representatives, and teachers. Although the actual process for selection may vary within each local area partnership, the process normally includes an application with supporting documentation, site visitations, interviews with building administration

The partnership planning team determines the priorities, procedures and application/approval process for the selection of the future PDS site(s). Factors normally considered in the approval and selection of a designated PDS school site include; but are not limited to, institutional commitments for:

1. long-term, sustained and systemic change.
2. implementing a collaborative research and development agenda.
3. using new, research-based ideas to improve instruction and learning.
4. formal collaboration with private and public agencies and individuals (e.g. business, social, and community services) to improve programming for children and youth.
5. participation of staff in school decision making. (MPNE, 1991)

A planning document for Professional Development School partnerships, which contains specific criteria for selection, and a sample application is shown in Appendix A.

The orientation phase is completed upon reaching a formal agreement between the school district and university to collaborate in the school district and with the selection of a specific school site within the district as the Professional Development School

Implementation

After the individual school(s) within the school district have been selected and designated as a Professional Development School, the implementation phase begins.

The university-school collaborative develops and implements school restructuring, focused on teaching and learning for all children. School organization, curriculum, community relationships, professional inquiry into practice, and professional development are all parts of the restructuring program.

Designing a management structure

In the implementation phase of Professional Development School establishment staffing and procedural relationships between the school site the local educational association, and the university are formalized.

A representative of the university usually called the building coordinator fulfills a liaison role between the school and the university. The building coordinator is in a unique position. Building coordinators serve as bridges between the world of the university and the world of the school--between broad visions for comprehensive change and the daily realities of university and school life. The building coordinator fosters communication, collaboration, and cooperation among a variety of participants with differing agendas and differing needs. The building coordinator initiates the PDS effort with the principal and teachers at the local school. The building coordinator attempts to establish the appropriate ethos and productive

possibilities of a PDS with the local administration and faculty. The building coordinator encourages procedures to build consensus and a staff oriented decision-making process at the PDS site. The decision-making process leads to a selection of what individual projects and activities are initiated at the school. A central role for a building coordinator is to effectively communicate between and among the various projects and individuals, both at the local school and the university.

The building coordinator is also charged with working with the existing university administration to redefine the nature of faculty teaching, research, and service within a PDS setting. The building coordinator must work to revise, modify, enhance or improve existing university norms to provide opportunities, incentives, and rewards for university participation in the PDS effort at the local school.

A local school, "PDS steering committee" or "PDS school council", is established to direct the internal policies of PDS involvement at the local site. Often the existing school improvement team or another existing internal team of school representatives serves as the PDS steering committee. Regardless of its official name the PDS "steering committee" is typically composed of instructional staff, doctoral students, the building coordinator from the university, university documenters, and the school building administrator. It is charged with the responsibility of creating and maintaining teacher investment and faculty participation in the PDS. New roles and decision-making responsibilities are also assumed by the steering committee to effectively communicate and work with the building administrator(s) and the university coordinator concerning PDS initiatives and projects. The PDS steering committee also takes a lead role in explaining PDS goals and expected outcomes to local board members, faculty members

members from other district buildings, parents, and community members who reside within the school district.

Implementing activities

One of the first steps in implementing a Professional Development School is to designate a university building coordinator. The PDS building coordinator serves as a liaison between the school and the university. The university building coordinator and the steering committee work together to find time for planning and PDS activities. Additional roles for university faculty to perform in a Professional Development School include the following:

1. facilitator- working with study and improvement teams of school personnel, parents, and community representatives to investigate issues relating to restructuring, content issues, pedagogy, school improvement, etc.
2. action researcher- helping to identify and solve instructional problems through descriptive, ethnographic, quantitative, or qualitative methodologies.
3. team teacher- trying out new instructional ideas through collaboration with a classroom teacher.
4. demonstration teacher- serving as a role model for preservice and inservice teachers.
5. resource person- providing materials, articles, and sharing subject matter and pedagogical ideas with classroom teachers.
6. PDS/ (public school) committee member- serving on PDS committees of teachers, university faculty, administrators, parents and community members

7. field supervisor- supervising and providing instruction for students participating in practicum, student teaching or internships.

School reform, restructuring, improved pre and inservice opportunities, and site based decision-making require the necessary minutes and hours in an already overcrowded schedule for proper planning and development. While there is no right answer for each PDS site, strategies such as purchased time, borrowed time, common time, freed-up time, better-used time, new time, and reassigned time are considered, deliberated and hopefully implemented.

The establishment of a PDS requires an extraordinary effort on the part of all faculty within the PDS. Proper planning and development time will help to avoid initial faculty stress, overwork, and employee burnout.

Operation

In the operation phase a "steady state" of continued school restructuring activity designed to improve and keep abreast of educational innovation is reached in a Professional Development School. Emphasis shifts from awareness of the potential benefits of a Professional Development School to the actual incorporation of certain elements of school reform and restructuring into the climate, culture and general functioning of the school.

Identifying Characteristics of a PDS

The following list illustrates some of the important new characteristics of schools operating as Professional Development Schools. The Professional Development School becomes a school

1. where there is a linkage of teacher development, curriculum and instructional development and organizational development to enhance learning for children.

2. which formally makes linkages with other private and public agencies and practicing professionals, and involves them in business program planning an and implementation of better programs for children and youth.

3. where there is an overriding commitment of all educators in the school to student learning with an emphasis on learning for understanding, higher order thinking, and the development and use of appropriate assessments for this kind of student learning.

4. where risks are taken, and where participants are willing to try new things, and are open to change and continuous learning.

5. which has diverse cultural and socio-economic characteristics and future goals.

6. where provisions are made for integrated preservice and inservice education of school and university faculty, i.e. teachers, administrators, parents, and other personnel, in the context of a learning community.

7. which has a memorandum of agreement formally binding the university and the school in a shared, long-term sustained collaboration.

8. which becomes center for inquiry into teacher education, teaching, learning, and school organization , including various kinds of research (e.g. collaborative, basic, and applied) and development for the purpose of improving education for all children.

9. where there is discussion about and demonstration of "best education practice" known at any given time.

The extraordinary work of faculty from the schools and the university should be recognized. This implies appropriate adjustments in work load

and/or compensation, since the occupational complexities and responsibilities clearly grow in this new institutional arrangement. (MSU, 1991)

Professional Development Schools are central to the mission of improving teacher preparation programs. Each professional development school is expected to demonstrate application of the best current knowledge of effective teaching, learning, educational management and community involvement. These schools also provide the setting for the preparation of future teachers and school administrators, action research to improve teaching and learning , and the development of community partnerships for improved learning.

References

Davis, S.,& Woloszyk, C.A. (1991). Professional Development School Handbook. Western Michigan University, College of Education Kalamazoo, MI.

Dewey, J. (1896). The university school. University Record, 5, 417-442.

Holmes Group. (1986). A Report of the Holmes Group: Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1990). A Report of the Holmes Group: Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1991). Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Michigan Partnership for a New Education. (1990) Executive Report. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Michigan Partnership for a New Education. (1991) Partnership Schools Criteria. East Lansing, MI: Author

Michigan State University, College of Education. (1991). School and University Alliance and Educational Extension Service Third Year (1990-91) Report. East Lansing, MI: Author

Schlechty, P. (1991). School's For The 21st Century. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Appendix A

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY AND PONTIAC SCHOOLS

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

CRITERIA FOR PARTNERS

1. Location

   1.1 Proximity
   1.2 Cultural diversity
   1.3 Socio economic mix

2. Institutional commitments to

   2.1 Long term, sustained, and development process of change
   2.2 Trying out new approaches to improve instruction and learning
   2.3 Collaboration between school and university and with external agencies
   2.4 Support partnership with time, space, and materials
   2.5 Release time for staff to participate in development (staff, curriculum, program and R & D)
   2.6 Educational improvement
   2.7 Excellence with equity
   2.8 Multicultural curriculum and instruction
   2.9 Integration of preservice and inservice education
   2.10 Active parental involvement

3. Institutional compatibility

   3.1 Congenial with school/university interests, talents, capacities
   3.2 Congenial with university and Pontiac Schools mission,philosophy, goals, and resources
   3.3 Reciprocal enthusiasm for and commitment to partnership between school and university

4. Personnel

   4.1 Demonstrated leadership for change
   4.2 Commitment to quality, collegiality, and equity
   4.3 Demonstrated potential for clinical, mentoring, and leadership roles
   4.4 Receptive to long term university presence (school)
   4.5 Receptive to working on-site in schools (university)

5. Shared understandings that

   5.1 There are no simple answers to complex problems - no quick fixes
   5.2 Everyone in the partnership is committed to long term learning
   5.3 There is a commitment to building a community of support and inquiry to improve education for all children
   5.4 Roles and responsibilities may change, overlap, conjoin, etc.
   5.5 Partnership will require flexibility and risk taking behavior

APPLICATION

for

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY-PONTIAC PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL

We appreciate and applaud your interest in and commitment to becoming a Professional Development School. As part of the application to become a Professional Development School we invite you to share with us information and perspectives regarding five key areas in your school: staff involvement in planning, current school improvement plans, parental involvement in the schools, receptivity to school change, and staff interest and commitment to implement the concept of a Professional Development School.

We ask that this application be signed by the Principal, Chair of the Coordinating Council and the PTA President of the school indicating their approval and support of the application.

Application to become a Professional Development School should be submitted by December 10, 1990 to:

Minnie Phillips
Executive Director, K-12 Instruction/Management
Administration Building

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What is the level of staff interest in and commitment to active and ongoing participation in building a Professional Development School?

APPLICATION

Oakland University-Pontiac
Professional Development School

This application is submitted with the approval and support of the administrators, teachers and parents of:

SCHOOL: .....

PRINCIPAL: .....

CHAIR(S) COORDINATING COUNCIL: .....

.....

.....

PTA PRESIDENT: .....

DATE: .....

Please describe how the school's Coordinating Council has functioned in joint school planning and decision making and team execution.

What are the school's current goals and plans for school improvement?

Describe and document how parents are involved in the schools.

Please document the receptivity of the school administration and teaching staff to school change.